ECCLESIA LAW

Private Ecclesiastical Counsel
United States & International

THE "KARL LENTZ" METHOD

MOVE THE COURT TO A COURT OF RECORD AND

DEMAND TO MEET THE INJURED PARTY

31ST January 2026

Date: January 31, 2026 **Subject:** Critique of "Common Law" Courtroom Strategy **To:** The Public Record & Legal Research Teams

---

1. Executive Summary

This report analyses the teachings of Karl Lentz, a prominent figure in the "sovereign citizen" and "freeman-on-the-land" movements who advocates for a specific style of "common law" courtroom conduct.

Ecclesia Law classifies the Lentz Method as **"Performative Obstructionism."** While Lentz's theories on the distinction between a "man" and a "person" are philosophically rooted in historical law, his practical application—specifically the refusal to engage with the court's established procedure in favor of "moving the court" via oral declarations—is fundamentally flawed.

Unlike **lawful status correction** (which operates primarily via the Treasury and administrative record), Lentz teaches a **confrontational courtroom strategy** that routinely results in contempt of court charges, summary judgments, and imprisonment.

---

2. The Methodology: What Karl Lentz Teaches

Lentz's entire model rests on the premise that modern statutory courts are "courts of no record" (or administrative tribunals) and that a "man" can force them into "Common Law" jurisdiction by speaking specific "magic words."

ECCLESIA LAW

A. The "Man vs. Person" Distinction

- **The Theory:** Lentz teaches that the "Strawman" (the ALL CAPS NAME) is a corporate fiction. He instructs followers never to answer to that name or act as the "Defendant."
- **The Tactic:** Instead of pleading "Guilty" or "Not Guilty," the follower is told to say: *"I am a man. I require you to show me the verified claim. Where is the injured party?"*

B. "Moving the Court"

- **The Theory:** He asserts that a man cannot be "judged" by a corporate employee (the judge) unless he consents.
- **The Tactic:** Followers are told to declare, *"I am moving this court to the Common Law,"* believing this verbal command strips the judge of statutory authority.

C. The "Verified Claim" Fallacy

- **The Theory:** Lentz argues that there is no crime without a victim (corpus delicti). Therefore, if the State cannot produce a "man" who has signed a sworn affidavit claiming injury, the case must be dismissed.
- **The Tactic:** In traffic or tax cases, the follower demands to cross-examine the "injured party," refusing to recognize the Prosecutor as a valid party.

---

3. Why It Fails: The Forensic Critique

Ecclesia Law asserts that while the *philosophy* of the "Strawman" has historical validity, the *application* taught by Lentz is suicidally dangerous in a modern courtroom.

A. The Jurisdiction Trap (Consent vs. Conquest)

- **The Reality:** Modern courts operate under **Statutory Jurisdiction** (Admiralty/Maritime or Civil Procedure). You do not "consent" to this jurisdiction by speaking; you are *subject* to it by physical presence and the presumption of the "Person."
- **The Flaw:** Shouting *"I do not consent"* or *"I move this court"* does not change the venue. The judge sees this not as a valid jurisdictional challenge, but as **procedural disruption**.
    - *Case Law:* In *Meads v. Meads* (2012 ABQB 571) and *United States v. Lentz* (2002), courts have explicitly ruled that "moving the court" is a meaningless phrase that holds no legal weight.

B. The "Injured Party" Misunderstanding

- **The Reality:** In statutory law (e.g., speeding, tax evasion), the "State" is the injured party. The statute *itself* creates the obligation. A human victim is not required for a crime to exist (e.g., driving without a license is a *malum prohibitum* offense).
- **The Flaw:** Demanding to see the "injured man" in a traffic case is irrelevant. The judge will overrule this instantly. Continued refusal to plead leads to a plea of "Not Guilty" being entered for you—or a contempt charge for wasting the court's time.

C. "Courts of Record" Confusion

- **The Reality:** Lentz claims statutory courts are not "Courts of Record." Legally, any court that keeps a permanent record of proceedings (including Traffic Court) *is* a Court of Record.
- **The Flaw:** Arguing with a judge about the definition of his own court is the fastest way to lose judicial sympathy. It signals to the judge that the defendant is using "OPCA" (Organized Pseudo legal Commercial Arguments) strategies, often triggering harsh "frivolous filing" penalties.

---

4. The "Lentz" Track Record

Karl Lentz's own history serves as the primary warning against his methods.

- **The "Baby K" Case:** Lentz originally rose to fame claiming he used these methods to get his son ("Baby K") back from CPS.
    - *The Truth:* Court records indicate he did *not* win via "Common Law" magic. The case involved standard procedural arguments, and he lost custody battles multiple times before any resolution.
- **United States v. Lentz (2002):** In his own federal case involving serious criminal charges, Lentz's "Common Law" arguments did not prevent the court from applying statutory sentencing guidelines.

ECCLESIA LAW

5. Conclusion: Strategy vs. Suicide

The **Karl Lentz Method** is a form of legal suicide. It empowers the "System" to label the individual as belligerent, mentally unstable, or a "Paper Terrorist."

- **Ecclesia Law Verdict:** You cannot "talk" your way out of a statutory box using magic words.
- **The Correct Path for debt:** True remedy lies in avoiding the court room altogether, correct standing via Envoy Protocol, add a new player onto the monopoly board Asset Fortress Protocol, offer to settle, recoup abandoned credit Infinite Money Protocol from the game board and discharge the liabilities attaching to the birth certificate artificial construct. No court appearance required.
- **The Correct Path for civil liability:** Remedy lies in being a better player than the prosecution. Review the prosecution's case for their Achilles heel, once you have found their weakness, expose it and win using their system.